



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/844,336	04/18/1997	PAMELA R. CONTAG	8678-004-999	7227
7590	02/15/2006		EXAMINER	
ROBINS & PASTERNAK LLP 1731 EMBARCADERO ROAD SUITE 230 PALO ALTO, CA 94303			ZEMAN, ROBERT A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/844,336	CONTAG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert A. Zeman	1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-9,21,22 and 25-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-9,21,22 and 25-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on 11-25-2005 is acknowledged. Claims 1 and 25-26 have been amended. Claims 23-24 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-9 21, 22 and 25-27 are pending and currently under examination.

Claim Rejections Maintained

35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3-9 21, 22 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contag et al. (U.S. Patent 5,650,135 – IDS filed on 10-5-98) in view of Georgiou et al. (U.S. Patent 5,348,867 – IDS filed on 1-22-99) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action in the rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 22-23 and 27.

The instant claims are drawn to a biodetector comprising a transmembrane fusion protein comprising an extracellular ligand-specific moiety derived from an antibody and an intracellular enzymatic signal transforming domain (i.e. signal-converting element) coupled to a reporter gene (luciferase) via a responsive element (transcription activation element) and a transducer. Said biodetector may further comprise a bacterial cell.

Contag et al. disclose biocompatible compounds comprising an entity such as a bacterial cell and a light-generating moiety such as luciferase (see column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 3). Contag et al. further disclose said moiety could be expressed via *in situ* synthesis in the entity (i.e. expression of a heterologous bioluminescent protein in a transformed cell or the *in situ* activatable promoter controlled expression of a bioluminescent protein [see column 3, lines 11-14, column 4, lines 18-21 and column 7, lines 31-39]). Contag et al. also disclose luciferase vector constructs that can be adapted for use in transforming a variety of host cells including bacteria (see column 10, lines 60-63). Finally, Contag et al. disclose the use of antibodies and antibody fragments to confer specificity to the compound. Contag et al. differs from the claimed invention in that they do not explicitly disclose the recombinant expression of the antibodies or antibody fragments on the bacterial surfaces. Georgiou et al. disclose methods for the recombinant expression of heterologous proteins on the surface of bacteria (see abstract) including the expression of scFv (see column 6, lines 25-26). Since Contag et al. disclose the use of antibodies and antibody fragments as targeting moieties (see column 3, lines 38-40), it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to use the heterologous scFv disclosed by Georgiou et al. in order to take advantage of the increase in specificity, diversity and ease of production associated with the resulting biodetector. It should be noted that claim 24 was mistakenly

omitted from the rejection recited in the previous Office action. Said claim was inadvertently indicated as being free of the art of record when the limitations of said claim was clearly disclosed in the cited art. The Examiner apologizes for any inconvenience this inadvertent error may have caused.

New Grounds of Rejection

35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3-9 21, 22 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, “a transmembrane fusion protein comprising an extracellular ligand-specific moiety derived from an antibody and an intracellular enzymatic signal transforming domain”. This phrase (i.e. combination of elements) does not appear in the specification, or original claims as filed. Applicant does not point out specific basis for this limitation in the application, and none is apparent. Additionally, there appears to be no recitation of the phrase intracellular enzymatic signal transforming domain” in either the specification or original claims as filed. Therefore this limitation is new matter.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3-9 21, 22 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the phrase "derived from an antibody". It is unclear what form said derivation is meant to take. Is said derivation merely an antibody fragment or does it possess additionally changes? As written, it is impossible to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the term "selectively recognizes". It is unclear what besides "binding to" said "recognition" could encompass.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "said substance" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "said fusion protein" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said intracellular transforming domain" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Claims 25-26 are free of the art of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A. Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday, 7am -5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (571) 272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ROBERT A. ZEMAN
PATENT EXAMINER

February 8, 2006